Appl. No. 10/516,962 Attorney Docket No. Serie 5742 Amdt. dated August 22, 2007 Reply to Office Action of May 22, 2007

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Office Action of May 22, 2007. This Amendment is fully responsive thereto.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Drawings with respect to the relative positions of the valve seat and valve head. Applicants have changed the lead line of reference character 34 (valve seat) to properly indicate a position above reference character 33 (valve head). A Replacement Sheet is being contemporaneously submitted with this paper. As such, the objection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner also rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as lacking antecedent basis for the phrase "said valve means". Applicants have amended the claim in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion thereby mooting the rejection.

The Examiner also rejected the following claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable:

- 11-23 over Watkins in view of lung;
- 11-23 over Lange; and
- 24 over Lange in view of Arzenton.

Applicants respectfully traverse each of the rejections because the references fail to disclose teach or suggest the claimed subject matter as amended.

Applicants have amended the independent claims to recite that:

- the lever has first and second legs
- a first end of the first leg is adjacent to the fifth axis
- a second end of the first leg is connected to a first end of the second leg
- a second end of the second leg is disposed at a point along the first axis between the second and third axes, and
- the first and second legs are angled away from another at a juncture of the first leg second end and the second leg first end.

The structure of the lever and the relative position of the second end of the second leg with respect to the second and third axes is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the cited references.

Appl. No. 10/516,962

Attorney Docket No. Serie 5742

Amdt. dated August 22, 2007

Reply to Office Action of May 22, 2007

With respect to the Examiner's argument regarding the patentability of relative size, the above recited limitations do not fall within the reasoning of *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). This is because they are not merely directed to a length of a dimension. Rather, they include an angled relationship between the first and second legs and a relative position of the second leg second end in between the second and third axes. On the other hand, the rejection of the claims at issue in Rose was directed to the length, width, height, and number of boards. *In re Rose*, at 240.

Should the examiner believe a telephone call would expedite the prosecution of the application, he is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below. It is believed that no fee is due at this time. If that belief is incorrect, please debit deposit account number 01-1375. Also, the Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment to deposit account number 01-1375.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher J. Cronin/ Christopher J. Cronin, Reg. No. 46,513

Date: August 22, 2007

Air Liquide 200 GBC Dr Newark, DE 19702 Phone: 302-286-5525

Fax: 302-286-5596